

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 31, 2006. Claims 1 to 8, 10 to 17, 19 and 20 are in the application, with Claim 9 having been cancelled herein. Claims 1, 16 and 17 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the specification does not disclose “an exclusion step of excluding the image layout format having the lowest frequency of use when the total number of frequencies of use exceeds the number set in the number setting step by adding a frequency of use of a new image layout format.” The rejections are respectfully traversed, since the meaning of the cited portion of the claims is clear to one skilled in the art. Moreover, the specification provides support for the cited portion at, for example, page 26, line 21 to page 27, line 9 and page 28, lines 13 to 15, which discuss one exemplary embodiment of the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 8, 11, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,462,759 (Kurtzberg); Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurtzberg, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,118 (Mishra); Claims 13, 14, 15, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurtzberg, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,613,057 (Caravel). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to displaying a plurality of images in one of an image layout format of a plurality of types. Among other aspects of the invention, a

frequency of use for each image layout format used in a medical examination is stored, a type of medical examination is set, and one of the image layout formats is set based upon frequencies of use corresponding to a medical examination having the set type of medical examination. In this way, a plurality of medical images can be displayed at corresponding positions based upon frequencies of use corresponding to a set type of medical examination.

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 1 defines an image display method for displaying a plurality of images in one of image layout formats of a plurality of types. The method comprises a frequency storage step of storing, for a medical examination, frequency of use for each of the image layout formats used in the medical examination. Each of the image layout formats includes a plurality of image display positions and types of medical images to be displayed at the plurality of image display positions. The method also comprises a first setting step of setting a type of medical examination, a second setting step of setting one of the image layout formats based upon frequencies of use corresponding to a medical examination having a type set in the first setting step, that have been stored, and a display step of displaying each medical image whose type is included in the image layout format set in the second setting step, at each image display position included in the image layout format set in the second setting step on a display.

Independent Claim 17 is directed to a computer-executable program that corresponds generally to the method of independent Claim 1. Independent Claim 16 is directed to an apparatus that includes, *inter alia*, features of a medical examination setting unit for setting a type of medical examination, a layout setting unit for setting one of the

plurality of image layout formats on said display, wherein said layout setting unit sets an image layout format based upon frequencies of use corresponding to a medical examination having a type set by the medical examination setting unit.

The applied references are not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 1, 16 and 17, and in particular, are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of a first step of setting a type of medical examination, and a second step of setting one of a plurality of image layout formats based upon frequencies of use corresponding to a medical examination having a type set in the first setting step.

Kurtzberg is seen to disclose an adaptive computer display window in which a frequency-of-use file for each action specified by a user is kept. (column 5, lines 36 to 37 of Kurtzberg). However, Kurtzberg is not seen to disclose or to suggest a first step of setting a type of medical examination, and a second step of setting one of a plurality of image layout formats based upon frequencies of use corresponding to a medical examination having a type set in the first setting step.

The remaining references, namely Mishra and Caravel, are not seen to cure the deficiencies of Kurtzberg, either alone or in any permissible combination.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 16 and 17 are believed to be allowable.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'E. Kmett', is written over a horizontal line.

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 119312v1